

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 26 July 2004. Responsive to that Office Action, Claims 10-11 and 22 are now cancelled, and Claims 1, 6, 12, and 17 are amended for further prosecution with the other pending Claims. With such amendment of Claims, there is a further clarification of the pending Claims' recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner first objected to the Specification for including a specific informality in the Abstract of the Disclosure. The Examiner also objected to the Disclosure for including a specifically noted typographical error. Both of these informalities are now removed by this Amendment. It is believed, therefore, that the Examiner's formal objections to the Specification are now obviated.

The Examiner objected to Claims 1, 12, and 17 also for a specifically noted informality, namely the inconsistent reference to a "PTAT" instead of a "first PTAT." Each occurrence of this informality, including its occurrence in Claim 6, is now removed by this Amendment, obviating the Examiner's formal concerns.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-18, and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Yamamoto, et al. reference. The Examiner further rejected Claims 8 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over that same Yamamoto, et al. reference.


As for Claims 11 and 22, however, the Examiner merely objected to them for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the subject matter of Claim 11 and its intervening Claim 10 are now incorporated into independent Claim 1, with Claims 10 and 11 being cancelled. Also, the subject matter of Claim 22 is now inserted into Claim 12, from which it had depended, with Claim 22 being cancelled. It is believed, therefore, that independent Claims 1 and 12 are now in allowable form, as are the remaining Claims which depend therefrom.

Such amendment of Claims are made in the interests of expediting prosecution of this case, given the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Such amendment of Claims are made, moreover, without addressing the merits of the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

MR2707-41
Serial Number: 10/623,635
Reply to Office Action dated 26 July 2004

It is respectfully submitted that the subject Patent Application has now been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Dated: 9/29/2004

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678